



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,867	11/27/2000	Maria Grazia Pau	4626US	4248
24247	7590	07/27/2005	EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			HILL, MYRON G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/722,867

Applicant(s)

PAU ET AL.

Examiner

Myron G. Hill

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,21,36,38-45 and 46- 52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,21,36,38,39,45 and 52 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-44 and 46-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/27/00.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

5001

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 1, 21, 36, 38, 39, 45, and 52 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 27 October 2003.

Claims 40-44 and 46-51 (Group III) are elected and under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

A signed and initialed copy of the IDS paper filed 27 November 2000 (list of copending applications) is enclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 40-44 and 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear what the metes and bounds required for "part" and "partial" are (what is the level of infectivity or purification).

The method also lacks a conclusion indicates that virus was concentrated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Merton *et al.*

The claims are drawn to a method of concentrating cell cleared influenza virus containing supernatant under low shear conditions.

Merton *et al.* teach that the crude cell culture supernatant containing influenza virus from *in vitro* cultured cells from a bioreactor is clarified first and that the virus is ultracentrifuged through a gradient (filtering by density) under low shear conditions (page 143, last paragraph).

While Merton *et al.* do not state "low shear" conditions, the step of gradient purification is known to preserve infectivity and thus keep the virus intact, not shearing it.

Where, as here, the Patent Office lacks the facilities to perform comparisons between the claimed material and prior art materials that reasonably appear to meet the claim limitations, the burden is properly shifted to applicant to distinguish the claimed product from the prior art product. See *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); *Ex Parte Gray*, 10 USPQ2nd 1922 (BPAI 1989).

Thus, Merton *et al.* anticipate the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-44 and 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merton *et al.* in view of Paul RW *et al.*

The claims are drawn to a method of concentrating cell cleared influenza virus containing supernatant under low shear conditions. The dependent claims add cutoff values for the filtration.

Merton *et al.* is discussed above.

Merton *et al.* do not teach hollow fiber ultracentrifugation.

Paul RW *et al.* teach ultracentrifugation of viruses with hollow fibers with a 500,000 MW cut off (500kDa.) and this results in a 10-30X concentration (page 610, column 1, lower paragraph). Paul RW *et al.* also teach that the infectivity of the input virus is maintained (page 610, top).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been familiar with the handling of influenza for different uses. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to clarify a supernatant and use a hollow fiber ultracentrifugation to concentrate the virus because gradient ultracentrifugation which is a procedure that requires time expensive materials and expensive

Art Unit: 1648

equipment. The use of filters with cutoff values is known in the art of handling cell culture supernatants and the choice of a specific cutoff would be determined.

Thus, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to concentrate the virus of Merton et al. using hollow fiber ultracentrifugation with the expectation of success in increasing the concentration of influenza virus and purifying it.

Double Patenting

Claim 1 of this application conflicts with claim 1 of Application No. 09/449,852. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

Conclusion


No claim is allowed.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myron G. Hill whose telephone number is 571-272-0901. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5 pm Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 1648

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Myron G. Hill
Patent Examiner
21 July 2005


JAMES HOUSEL 7/25/05
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600